

**CITY OF ROCKLIN  
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

October 20, 2009  
Rocklin Council Chambers  
Rocklin Administration Building  
3970 Rocklin Road  
([www.rocklin.ca.us](http://www.rocklin.ca.us))

---

1. Meeting Called to Order at 6:30 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was lead by Commissioner Shirhall
3. Roll Call

Commissioner Shirhall, Chairman  
Commissioner Sully, Vice Chairman  
Commissioner Coleman  
Commissioner McKenzie  
Commissioner Menth – Absent with cause

Others Present:

Scott Yuill, Vice Mayor  
Terry Richardson, Assistant City Manager  
Russell Hildebrand, City Attorney  
Laura Webster, Senior Planner  
David Mohlenbrok, Senior Planner  
Bret Finning, Associate Planner  
Larry Wing, City Engineer  
Candace Johnson, Planning Commission Secretary

About 14 others

4. Minutes –  
  
The minutes of September 15, 2009 were approved as submitted.
5. Correspondence - None
6. Citizens Addressing the Commission on Non Agenda Items - None

**Scheduled Items:**

7. **ROCKLIN COMMONS (PAVILION)  
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, PDG-2006-01  
TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, DL-2006-07  
USE PERMIT, U-2006-13  
DESIGN REVIEW, DR-2006-19  
OAK TREE PRESERVATION PERMIT TRE-2006-29  
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT DA-2008-03  
DONAHUE SCHRIBER**



The applicant is proposing to subdivide 40+ acres of undeveloped land consisting of four existing parcels into 20 commercial lots. A use permit and design review approval are also requested that would allow the construction of a commercial shopping center consisting of 415,000 square feet of retail space. An Oak Tree Preservation Plan Permit will also be necessary to allow the removal of several existing oak trees on the site. The proposed development agreement will regulate the validity of the map and define contributions to public improvements.

The subject property is located between Granite Drive, Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80. APN #045-041-012, 024, 045-051-003, 004.

The property is zoned Planned Development, Commercial (PD-C). The General Plan designation is Retail Commercial (RC).

Notice is hereby given that the City of Rocklin intends to adopt an Environmental Impact Report for the project described above. The review period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report began on July 27, 2009 and ended on September 9, 2009.

The project site is not on any of the lists enumerated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code related to hazardous waste.

The applicant and property owner is Donahue-Schriber Realty Group L.P.

David Mohlenbrok presented the environmental review portion of the project.

The Commission had no questions for Mr. Mohlenbrok.

Bret Finning presented the staff report and outlined proposed changes to various conditions presented in the blue memo provided to the Planning Commission.

The Commission had questions for Mr. Finning regarding the following:

1. Prohibited uses.
2. Large graphics proposed on buildings.
3. What happens to signage if building is vacated.
4. Chain link fencing.
5. Consequences of a solid wall around the detention basin.
6. Design review process.
7. Ten year approvals in Development Agreement.

Applicant's representative, Mark Pearlberger, addressed the Commission. Mr. Pearlberger gave a PowerPoint presentation and showed a short animation representing the future center. Mr. Pearlberger introduced Jan Petersen from Donahue Schriber. Ms. Petersen stated that she would like to build in 2011 and be open in 2012.

Commissioner Sully: "Going back to the landscaping at the entrances, by looking at the movie it looked like the secondary or the service entrance that I could see landscaping there but the other entrance coming in from, that is the service entrance, that has pretty good landscaping there on the corner but I did not ever get a really good view of what the Granite drive entrance would look like. I don't see as much landscaping there as I see at the service entrance."

Mr. Pearlberger: "This whole section (refers to landscape plan) is enhanced paving. There is a planter in the middle of this that is landscaped as well. The details on the materials that you have in the packet in front of you are probably a little easier to view it on. (graphic is shown on screen) There is landscaping, both tree plantings and ground cover at different levels on both sides of this as well as a planter strip in the middle."

Commissioner Sully: "The planter strip in the middle just has small bushes?"

Mr. Pearlberger: "Yes. One of the reasons why that works the way it is is because of how the grade elevation works from Granite Drive to the center. The focal point of our landscaping is much more in these two areas (points to graphic on screen) than in this center area."

Commissioner Sully: "I'm just a really visual person and I didn't see a direct shot of that."

Mr. Pearlberger: "I don't have a direct shot of that."

Commissioner Sully: "Going back to the other one on Sierra College Boulevard coming in, obviously the City owns that part so you haven't done anything with that, is there any spot where you can show me what it looks like when we get into where your property begins? I think I saw some enhanced paving in there but is there anything else in there, is there any signage on either side, is there any kind of archway announcing that you're coming in?"

Mr. Pearlberger: "Let's go back to our slideshow."

Jan Petersen: "As you come in that is where we have the clock tower. We have agreed with staff that we will increase the amount of enhanced paving so what you are seeing there is kind of a gap."

Commissioner Sully: "Do you have signage right in there?"

Ms. Petersen: "Right on either side we have an obelisk on either side as you come in that announce Rocklin Commons. So there is one on either side and then there is the clock tower."

Commissioner Shirhall: "While we are on this image, how big in square do you think those obelisks are?"

Mr. Pearlberger: "I thought they were a little taller than five feet. Eight and a half feet tall and six feet wide."

Commissioner McKenzie: "I hate to go back to this one but, on the fencing issue, on the detention basin, any idea what the grade differential is between the site and Harley Davidson? It's one thing for it not to be seen within your site, it's another thing for it to be seen within another site."

Mr. Pearlberger: "There is fencing on this side as well between the Harley facility and our site."

Ms. Petersen: "We have also been talking to staff that that's an area where we are going to try to transplant some additional young oak trees to do further screening. We have a row of evergreens to screen, then the building and then the corner of a building so before you would see the basin you would have to see through all of that."

Commissioner McKenzie: "Another question regarding the environmental features. Any pause from you if we were to require those to not be optional? That would definitely be my preference. In seeing these as I have made my travels around the country looking at newer shopping centers that have these they have been incorporated into designs. I like the way they look, I like the way the function in other centers, and would like to see them here as a matter of fact rather than a matter of option."

Mr. Pearlberger: "I will defer to Jan, I think that we would prefer to have the option. The design guidelines also provide for transitional walls, so there is language in there that clearly would direct staff that there are not going to

be blank walls no matter what happens, there has to be some treatment dealing with how that looks. We are generally looking for as much flexibility on these issues as we can.”

Ms. Petersen: “I can tell you that initially the buildings that we are placing in the front we are definitely doing the graphics there. Our company is very pleased with the centers where we have done it. We have talked to staff about the fact that we are using these types of graphics in vacant stores to enhance the look if you have a vacancy.”

Mr. Pearlberger: “Getting back to your earlier question our site is about five feet higher than the Harley Davidson site.”

Commissioner Coleman: “I had asked staff about the sign removal, could you address that?”

Ms. Petersen: “Yes I can address that. Our policy is that when tenants leave they take their signs with them and the holes are patched right away. We actually have a place for a potential management office on site and we don’t like to see signs that are put upside down or anything that detracts from the center. Removal of signs is written as a condition of our leases.”

Commissioner Coleman: “What do you think the architectural hook is to get people into this shopping center?”

Ms. Petersen: “The biggest hook that we have been working on is to try to make it as flexible as possible so that it didn’t have a cookie cutter style. It has a small scale village look but at the same time we’ve been able to take the tower elements that we can use in the bigger scale buildings. For the scale of the project we have a lot of stuff going on and that makes it interesting. I think for us it’s the opportunity to have a place where people want to come and hang out. We think we are going to be able to get some restaurants here. We’re starting to see some restaurants, we just had dinner at Bistro 33, maybe they could open another location here. So we feel we are going to attract things to the community, we want to work with the community, we’ve been doing this with the triptychs, so those are they types of hooks that we want.”

Commissioner Coleman: “Other than the brick and the mortar what does Donahue Schriber do to make that village concept real? What do you do in promoting the village concept as an owner/developer?”

Ms. Petersen: “As an owner/developer we have our own marketing staff, we don’t just hire outside marketing firms. Our marketing people work with the tenants, they have merchant’s meetings, and they create events such as Halloween costume parades, fingerprinting events, promoting bike to work programs. They are actively looking for different things to bring customers in. The types of major tenants that we are hoping to sign are looking to do a lot of promotions to be part of the community so we feel that this would be a good thing for the City.”

Mr. Pearlberger: “As a good example, when Donahue took over Town & Country they changed the back portion of that dramatically and the nature of the tenants, and also did a marketing push and generated a lot of publicity for their tenants and the shopping center to try to help them.”

The hearing was opened to the public for their comments.

Ralph Trimm, Rocklin, CA, stated that he liked the project however his property would be adversely affected by the proposed traffic controls and expressed dissatisfaction with that aspect of the project, especially the limited number of proposed vehicular connections between the Commons site and his property.

The hearing was closed to the public.

Commissioner Shirhall: “I think this evening I’m going to take this one first because then I can address a few of my concerns and then that will save us from coming back after the fact to get your input and feedback on that if that’s okay with everybody. First and foremost I’d like to thank Donahue Scriber for the projects that they have been and

are bringing to the City of Rocklin. Their investment into the community is very significant; I appreciate their philosophy of development and management of property. They are one of the few companies that develop their properties and manage their properties, they hold on to their assets and that is a fantastic thing for our community. Their commitment to develop in Rocklin does not go unnoticed. Specific to the project, and I'll speak to the environmental piece and get that out of the way. First and foremost, I have met with the Donahue team on many occasions and just need to declare my ex parte communication with them. Relative to the environmental report, I find that the public agency has evinced good faith and reasoned analysis in response to the environmental questions that have been raised. I further find that the impacts related to this project are consistent with the City of Rocklin General Plan. I find that the EIR has adequately served the disclosure purpose that which is central to the EIR process. I find that the mitigation measures as described are feasible and can be accomplished in a reasonable amount of time. As such I am comfortable recommending certification of this EIR to the City Council. I appreciate the work, as always, that Mr. Mohlenbrok and the Planning Department has put forth in making sure we have a thorough environmental report and document. Specific to the project, this project is fantastic. I think it is very complimentary to what is proposed across the freeway. Development of this nature has been considered on this corner as far back as 1972 and probably before when it was annexed into the City. Development of this project really helps Rocklin fulfill many of its General Plan policies that have been in place for years as far as traffic flow and getting other roadways put in, bringing jobs to our city, keeping shoppers in our city and all of that being stated, I just want to make clear that this is a fantastic proposed project and I truly hope the tenants that Donahue Schriber are hoping to sign will see the value of this. I believe they will, this is a major corner along Interstate 80, there aren't many of those left between here and San Francisco, certainly between here headed east toward Tahoe. All those things being stated, I concur with the parking lot lighting request, the taller standards. We approved it across the way and it makes it consistent also makes for fewer standards in the parking lot. I also concur in the C-2 zone the building height as detailed in the staff report. I have no issues with the conditional use permit for the theaters. I certainly concur with staff on the prohibited use listing and just wanted to get it on record and Bret, thank you for explaining that, that we are being careful with what is coming into these projects. The exposed neon, while I understand the uniqueness of it and what it can offer from a signage standpoint, I'm opposed to it. At the same time, I would say to the applicant that if you have a restaurant or a store that wants to do something unique with exposed neon, I would welcome you to bring it to the Planning Commission in the same manner as Lucille's restaurant, they have exposed neon signs on their restaurant, but to just give blanket authorization in a center of this size, I am not in favor of that. Personally I'm not in love with the exposed neon I've seen in other centers. The building mounted graphics, if you couldn't tell, it's an amenity that really markets the shopping center. It's an amenity that I think goes to the ultimate success, it gives it a unique look, I am very confident, as I work with retailers daily in my professional life, that retailers would want to be very involved in those types of graphics and it is my hope that there will be more of those types of graphics and that it does not become optional. By the same token, I understand that you need flexibility. We can't simply say that they need to be approved in all the locations because that might not work with future prospective tenants but I truly hope that those do come to fruition. The triptychs are truly unique, the entire back elevation along Granite Drive is fantastic I think you had a particularly difficult situation to work with, putting the backs of buildings close to a major road like that and you have done a fabulous job of softening the effect with tiered landscaping and with breaking up the rear of those large buildings. I appreciate that and again I appreciate your commitment to the City in trying to do something unique. The fencing, this is a discussion we have had over and over again over the years on the Planning Commission, we've gotten away from chain link fencing everywhere, certainly we've gotten away from slats because they don't weather the test of time very well and that becomes a solid exposure for graffiti and to allow that there is inconsistent with what we've done elsewhere in the City so I would be in favor of putting the traditional tubular steel fencing. Background colors on signage, I'm fine, I'm not worried about that. The design criteria, I'd say I don't like it but with Donahue Schriber I have a comfort level. City Council has made it really clear that this is the direction that they want to go at this time and I respect that, so thankfully the design criteria are there. That being said tonight is our chance to comment on this project, how it is going to come together, what the details are going to be. I'm happy to say, that I'm pleased with the details in the village, I'm pleased with the outdoor seating areas, I get the clock tower and the tall signage and the need for that. I like a lot of what I see but where I am going with this is my one concern, which myself and Mr. Pearlberger have discussed at length, and I don't want to make this too big an issue because I appreciate the totality of this project. I get shopping center envy as a Planning Commissioner so



when I'm around town or around the state or in Boston or what have you, I get shopping center envy and Major A there is a design rendering, there is an executed building that recently opened in Davis which is very similar to the proposed Major A. I just want to point out to the Commission, I just have a concern with one building, the Major E I've done some research and that is as nice a building as you are going to get, but the Major A building I have some concerns and I am hoping to share those with you, not that I want our Major A to look like somebody else's but rather just to consider some of the elements that are seen in this other major and want your thoughts if some of these things should or could be included as a design prospect, because this building is 158,000 square feet, it is the big building you are going to see."

Assistant City Manager asked to take a short break for the court reporter.

A recess was called at 7:57 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:04 p.m.

### **Commission Deliberation/Discussion:**

Commissioner Shirhall showed photos of a similar building design to the Major A building in Davis and described the use of shed roofing, more brick work and architectural features that he felt would enhance the proposed Major A building.

Commissioner Shirhall: "There are some nice details incorporated into this very large building which soften the effect of that large building. I am okay with, with the exception of the fencing, every request of Donahue Schriber, I am just hoping that we could have a few more details included in this very large building in this project. I don't want to overstate that this has to be done but I would like to have a few of details included in this project. I understand the climate today but cost is a real issue which is why I am not saying we should do everything we see here, but I think we could soften the building here and make it a little nicer."

Commissioner McKenzie: "I will begin with the entire project and end with design considerations. When looking at this project and its history and location I think it is the right project at the right time in the right location. From a circulation perspective, it couldn't be served better than by the new Sierra College Boulevard interchange. That is definitely a positive for the center, for Rocklin and traffic related implications of a center of this size. Having been through every page of the EIR, of the staff report, statement of overriding considerations, range of alternatives, we're good from both a practical perspective also a legal perspective relative to their completeness and giving us alternatives to consider as we make our decision. In terms of the design of this project, I tend to look at the whole of the project, I like the project, I like the town center feel of the project, I like the environmental graphics, those fit very well together. As I look at the Major A, I have some concern there relative to the lack of articulation of the roofline, but I think in looking at the whole of the project it makes up for that lacking element for me. It does have stone in it, it does have the pilasters in front of the entry, the landscaping, the trellis, for me that works and I tend to focus less on the Major A and its tenant than I do the town center and the quality that it brings so I have a little bit less concern there. I think in a lot of respects we agree on the exposed neon, we're on the same page there, the environmental graphics, I would love to see them and I understand the need for flexibility there. As it relates to the fencing, detention basins are impossible. There is no good other solution to them, they don't need to be the most attractive things in the world but I have seen fencing that is bare look horrible because you can see into them but the fencing, because of its proximity to another tenant I agree on the requirement for tubular steel, we might as well do it right the first time because it is really hard to bring that back and fix it later. The background sign colors, I'm good with it. Given the nature of the center, the variety of potential users I'm fine with having, those background colors be a little different. From that perspective I definitely support the project.

Commissioner Sully: "First of all I recommend the certification of the EIR to the City Council. This project site has been part of the commercial development and part of the General Plan for years so I think that the use is excellent and the project as a whole is a wonderful project. As far as some of the specific comments that I have, I am also opposed to exposed neon. I agree with Commissioner Shirhall, bring it back to us if you have that because

we have used it in other projects, I think at Lucille's we thought it was an art feature. I'm not opposed to it altogether; I just don't want to put it in as part of the design. As far as the chain link fence goes, I would say it's inconsistent so I would stay with staff's recommendation and keep it tubular steel. As far as the free standing sign goes, and the background colors, I agree with the applicant, I don't have any problem with putting the background colors on that sign. I'm ok with the building height, I'm okay with the light pole height, I'm okay with the signage height. I think the use of the exposed graphics looks phenomenal, it is definitely a bonus and a great feature and makes this whole center so I hope that stays and is not an option. The idea of the plaza that you have with the fireplace and the gathering places I think you've done a phenomenal job with that, I think that looks great. As you probably heard my comments earlier, I am very into the enhancement of entryways into the centers. Making sure that we have the enhanced pavement, making sure that the landscaping, staff I leave that to you, and know that I am really looking for enhanced landscaping and any signage that goes out in that area. As far as Commissioner Shirhall's comments on the Major A building, I would agree that I would like more architectural features or something different. We have the trellis up there and it seems that what we put that on every building now, so the fact that there was the different roofing, I liked that feature. That would be something that I would like to see, maybe not necessarily that but something different, other than just the trellis feature, not the trellis that goes up the side, but the overhang trellises. I like the tower feature on it, I'm not asking you to put that in, but there are some things that, particularly I would say if we could do anything to change the wooden structures just because we are putting that in everywhere. Other than that, the project I think as a whole is wonderful; I do have to say that I do like the lighting poles better than the other shopping center. Those are my general comments with the fact that if staff can address Mr. Trimm's comments with the stop lights and what we are doing with that area."

Commissioner Coleman: "I have had ex parte communication on a couple of occasions with the applicant. We reviewed the project and they asked for comments but no commitments and I gave comments and no commitments. I do agree with my fellow commissioners on most of the points that they have made tonight but I'd like to take it from a different perspective. Even though this project will probably not open until 2012, when it does it will still need to compete and it will be in competition with Roseville. It's going to compete with the two shopping centers we have and the mall in Roseville. Southbound traffic on Highway 65 is not going to pass those two shopping centers and a big mall to come all the way out here to this shopping center. Granite Drive is not a major thoroughfare that Galleria Boulevard is, so it doesn't carry the traffic that Galleria Boulevard does. We need to look at Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 and make sure that we can capture as much traffic off of those roads as we can for these shopping centers. I am not sure that given the project site and the loss of the front part of this project due to City property, I'm not sure that we have enough hooks on this thing to get the traffic. I think that probably lends some credibility to Chairman Shirhall's tower structure. We need something that sparks that shopping center that stops that traffic and brings it in. I know we have the one tower element, I just don't think we have enough here to do the job. I would like to hear what my fellow commissioners' thoughts are on that."

Commissioner Shirhall asked Commissioner McKenzie what his thoughts were regarding Commissioner Coleman's comments.

Commissioner McKenzie: "We've got that large tower element out by the highway, that's really what they are relying on to draw people in, is that enough? Obviously the owner is at risk of not doing enough. From a design perspective, does that work for me? The tower that is there, it definitely does. If those comments are directed back to the Target building and enhancing that, I'm pretty comfortable looking at a lot of Targets around the country with that storefront elevation, just in Roseville, as compared to what we might be doing here there no step up from this Target building. Even though I'm a little bit concerned relative to that elevation, that, to me, is a second seat to what's occurring in the rest of the center from a design perspective, from a landscape perspective, from an environmental graphic perspective, I think all of that supersedes the need for additional articulation on that building."

Commissioner Shirhall: "I don't know where to go with your comments, I understand exactly what you're saying. It seems to be the bells and whistles are attracting people to centers, and I'll use as an example, the Fountains. Who would have ever thought that they would draw the people in that but they are because people sit around the big

water fountain and watch it dance with fancy lights? They have not incorporated something like that into the village portion of this center, as a commission, I don't know how to get them to do that, it's their project to develop and it certainly meets the General Plan requirements for the area so its very complicated. Donahue Schriber certainly knows how to build successful centers, and I'm sure they've done their research as they don't want it to fail. There is no hook. What is going to draw people in? Hopefully it is going to be good restaurants and tenants and people will come. That hook today seems to be bigger than ever and the Fountains is a prime example."

Commissioner Coleman: "It's as much entertainment as it is shopping."

Commissioner Shirhall: "I hear your comments but by the same token, as a Planning Commission I just don't know what we can do with them."

Commissioner Sully: "I think this shopping center is not going to draw the people coming down the Highway 65 corridor, I think they are going to go to the Galleria. I think this is going to draw more from other areas more from Interstate 80. Am I in agreement that the park and ride right in front of the project is a detriment? I'd like to see that gone, but we still need a park and ride. If that wasn't City property and we could enhance that area I think that that would definitely help. I would agree with Commissioner Shirhall that's really not our say to do that and hopefully by the time this comes to fruition there are some things that could change. Overall I think the project is a great project and I think that we will be drawing a different crowd coming to this center than what you are going to see going to the Galleria Mall or the Fountains."

Commissioner Shirhall: "I would follow that up with that we are approving a concept and I have a feeling over the course of potentially the next ten years, I hope not, there may be some changes to the villages, hopefully they will take our comments to heart and develop more of a hook that will draw more people in on Friday and Saturday night. I didn't make comment on it but the idea that they could close off that street and do food fairs and street fairs, which is what is going on over at the Fountains, car shows and all kinds of fantastic events, they've certainly done an amazing job over there, it is certainly my hope that we'll have something like that in our area and certainly that village lends itself to that opportunity."

Commissioner Shirhall asked staff to address the issue with Mr. Trimm's property.

David Mohlenbrok: "I spoke with City Engineer, Larry Wing, at the break and what he and I spoke of with respect to what Cal Trans envisioned or what they required in terms of when the off ramp was essentially serving as a driveway to the project. Cal Trans specifically wanted a more circuitous route and not a direct entry route into the project and that is what is reflected in this design here. It is also important to note that there will be cross access between this property and the Trimm property as depicted in that graphic by a driveway that will be common that will allow access between the two properties."

Commissioner Shirhall: "Is there an established easement through there? Would there need to be one?"

David Mohlenbrok: "The reciprocal access agreement exists at least in half form with the respect to the development of this property. Similarly when the Trimm property came in we'd look to complete the second part of the reciprocal access agreement."

Bret Finning: "That is essentially correct. This project is conditioned to provide a reciprocal access or equivalent in favor of the Trimm property and then when the Trimm property is developed we would, as a matter of course, require them to give similar access rights to this project so that they can have traffic back and forth. As you can see (referring to an exhibit) right in here is where there is a vehicular connection designed for the future interplay between the two projects."

Commissioner Shirhall: "He has a large footprint there, is there any additional reciprocal access further down as you head down toward Major A?"



Bret Finning: "No, as the project is designed there is only one point of access. There were some grading issues and other things that made it difficult to provide multiple points of access. There were also some issues on the negotiation at the time with potential tenants on the site and their requirements that made it further complicated. There would be nothing, of course, to prevent Donahue Schriber and Mr. Trimm or future owners of that property from negotiating additional connections, should that be to everyone's benefit in the future but at this time with this project there is only a single point envisioned and conditioned as the project is before you."

Commissioner Shirhall suggested that Mr. Trimm take a copy of the project packet and work with Mr. Mohlenbrok and Mr. Finning to discuss the access point. He stated that he would have further opportunity to discuss the subject at the City Council meeting.

Commissioner Shirhall invited Mr. Pearlberger back up to address the issues that were brought up by the Commission.

Mr. Pearlberger: "We really appreciate everyone's comments and input. We're very proud that you've recognized the work that your staff and our staff have put in to get us here. I know that you do recognize the marketplace today. A couple of thoughts first, we are pleased that you'll consent to the sign background and I understand your position on the neon. As it relates to Major A (refers to the exhibit), this is the elevation of our Major A as it stands today. I hear clearly Commissioner Coleman's comments about hooks and how to get people into the center. We think that the center overall as a package offers quite a lot of amenities, not unlike what Commissioner Sully said, and we have the ability to what we can do to mimic some of the aspects of The Fountains, obviously not with a fountain, I might add that there are some tenant issues there it's not an easy marketplace, and that is very instructive. What is going to make this property work, I might add again to distinguish this from The Fountains, this property is fed directly from an interchange. That makes it a different animal, from circulation, to architecture, to site planning, and we've tried to use the best of our abilities to address this site and create the ambiance that will work and be something for the community to the best of our judgment. Specifically, as to this building, what's going to be the hook for this shopping center and this building is the tenant, we need to get the right tenant. That does become, especially today, a design issue, and an economic issue. The store in Davis that we were talking about for Target was conceived in about 2004, they had the ballot measure in 2006 and it opened a month or so ago. To relate 2004 to 2010 and 2012, it's a brave new world. The retail world is different; these projects are different as evidenced by the fact that we don't have a tenant. That store was a corporate store where there was someone available to choose to make those decisions and agree to pay for them. We are not in a position to do that for this property as it stands today, to the extent that it is somewhat unlikely that ultimately this exact frontage will be whatever tenant lands there, whether it's Target or somebody else, at that time and place is exactly what they want. I think it is pretty likely that this will come back in front of you. That is really the best that I can offer in terms of committing to making changes to accommodate this. Given the economic environment, the timing in the market cycle the fact that I don't have a tenant for any portion of this center, I am not in a position to step up beyond this what we can do. When I look at this, and I know it is a matter of taste, this is an attractive building in a first rate shopping center. That doesn't mean that it's the nicest center in the Sacramento region or it's the nicest major elevation in the region, but it is appropriate for this site in our view, it is appropriate for this time in the market cycle in our view and what we can do. I know as Planning Commissioners you have to take a long term view. We would not also as property owners, take anything but a long term view, remember Donahue owns these things pretty much forever in their history so we're not short timers merchant builders trying to get out of it, we have to be comfortable that what we are presenting will stand the test of time and we believe that this does. What the hook will be on this freeway frontage property, that has signage to let everybody know who's there, is who is in it. How we're going to get the best tenant in this marketplace is to have a first rate product that competes financially. Because that's how we're going to land a tenant when they come back, assuming they do and we all hope they will, they're going to be looking to cut some deals. We need to be able to work with them and still be able to look you in the eye and say that this is a center that you should approve. I can comfortably do that tonight. I believe this is a center that you should approve being promoted by a developer who will deliver the best product they can to you."

Commissioner Coleman: "Does this project as we see it tonight have adequate signage?"

Mr. Pearlberger: "From a retail perspective you can never have too much signage. We are okay with this signage; it would be a cost benefit issue if we had the right to put another tower sign up. We would have to look at what would we get for spending that money, would that make a difference with a tenant, would we welcome the opportunity to have that discussion with a tenant knowing we could do it? The answer would be yes."

Commission Coleman: "I was thinking about the tower, is that something that you would consider?"

Mr. Pearlberger: "We would absolutely consider another tower signage element. We focused on the one tower and there is a second pylon sign down here at the other end of the project, so there are two pylon signs. Again, more signage is something retailers thoroughly enjoy."

Commissioner McKenzie asked the applicant to see the two different perspectives showing the tower signs.

Commissioner Shirhall: "I have made my points, it's going to City Council they will have their opportunity to make comments on it too. I think that it is strange that we are approving something in concept. I'm hoping that it does come to be and I'm hoping that they'll see the value in improving the look of that building or in doing something different. We have these trellis features on so many buildings it would just be nice to see something different. I think Donahue Schriber has tried to do some very different things in this shopping center and it would only compliment that which you have tried to do."

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, FINDINGS OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, APPROVAL OF A MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM AND DIRECTION TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR TO FILE A NOTICE OF DETERMINATION (Rocklin Commons / PDG-2006-01, DL-2006-07, U-2006-13, DR-2006-19, TRE-2006-29, DA-2008-03) was approved by the following vote:

Roll Call Vote:

AYES:	Commissioners Sully, McKenzie, Coleman and Shirhall
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	Commissioner Menth
ABSTAIN:	None

Motion carried: 4/0

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner Coleman, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (NORTHWEST QUADRANT I-80 / SIERRA COLLEGE BLVD.) (Rocklin Commons PDG-2006-01) was approved as amended by the following vote:

## **F. PARKING LOT LIGHT POLE HEIGHTS**

All parking lot light poles used along Granite Drive shall be a maximum of 20 feet high as measured from the ground to the top of the fixture. All other parking lot light poles shall be a maximum of 27.5 feet high as measured from the ground to the top of the fixture *as generally indicated on the Photometric Plan, Sheet SE1P of Exhibit A of Design Review DR-2006-19.*

### **I. PROHIBITED SIGNS**

1. *Open face channel letter or logo with exposed neon is not an acceptable sign approach or type.*

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Commissioners Sully, Coleman, McKenzie, and Shirhall  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Commissioner Menth  
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried: 4/0

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner Coleman, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A DESIGN REVIEW AND AN OAK TREE PRESERVATION PLAN PERMIT (Rocklin Commons / DR-2006-19, TRE-2006-29) was approved as amended by the following vote:

#### **4. Improvements / Improvement Plans**

Project improvements shall be designed, constructed and / or installed as shown on the approved improvement plans, in compliance with applicable city standards. The project improvement plans shall include the following:  
(ENGINEERING, PLANNING)

- h. For the following off-site improvements in the Town of Loomis, the project developer shall attempt, in good faith, to enter into an agreement with the Town of Loomis by which the developer either shall be responsible for constructing the improvements as required or shall provide to the Town of Loomis funding in an amount equal to the agreed upon estimated fair share cost of the improvements as required for those improvements requiring a fair share contribution:

i) Horseshoe Bar Road/Taylor Road

A northbound right-turn lane from *Taylor Road to Horseshoe Bar Road* shall be striped at the intersection of Taylor Road and Horseshoe Bar Road.

12. Project Design

- a. All pilasters used on Majors A – E shall have a minimum depth of 12 inches ~~and a maximum depth of 18 inches~~.

24. Walls and Fences

- a. *No bare chain link shall be used anywhere on the project site. (PLANNING)*  
b. *The detention basin shall be secured with black powder coated tubular steel fencing. (PLANNING)*

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Commissioners Sully, Coleman, McKenzie, and Shirhall  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Commissioner Menth  
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried: 4/0

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (Rocklin Commons / DL-2006-07) was approved by the following vote:

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Commissioners Sully, McKenzie, Coleman and Shirhall  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Commissioner Menth  
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried: 4/0

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner Coleman, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A USE PERMIT ALLOWING FOR OUTDOOR STORAGE, OUTDOOR DINING, AND OUTDOOR DISPLAY (Rocklin Commons / U-2006-13) was approved as amended by the following vote:

Section 2. The conditional use permit for Rocklin *Commons* ~~Crossings~~ (U-2006-13) is hereby recommended for approval as depicted and further described in Exhibit A of the concurrent design review DR-2006-19 also recommended for approval via Planning Commission Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ and included therein, subject to the conditions listed below. Unless expressly stated otherwise, the applicant/developer shall be solely responsible for satisfying each condition and the conditions must be satisfied prior to issuance of the building permit, or issuance of certificate of occupancy as determined by the Director of Community Development.

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Commissioners Sully, Coleman, McKenzie, and Shirhall  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Commissioner Menth  
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried: 4/0

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner Coleman, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROCKLIN AND ROCKLIN PAVILLIONS, LLC, AND ROCKLIN PAVILLIONS SALES, LLC, Relative To The Development Known AS THE ROCKLIN COMMONS REGIONAL SHOPPING CENTER (Rocklin Pavillions, LLC and Rocklin Pavillions Sales, LLC / DA-2008-03) was approved by the following vote:

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Commissioners Sully, Coleman, McKenzie, and Shirhall  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Commissioner Menth  
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried: 4/0

**8. ROCKLIN CROSSINGS AND ROCKLIN COMMONS  
STREET NAME CHANGE  
STREET NAME CHANGE, SNC-2009-01  
RSC ENGINEERING, INC.**

This application is a request for a street name change to officially approve the following:

1. Name the main entry to the proposed Rocklin Crossings shopping center Crossings Drive;



2. Change Crossings Parkway (previously approved with the Croftwood SNC, SNC-2007-01) to Schriber Way;
3. Name the Dominguez over crossing extension future loop road Dominguez Loop;
4. Name the main entries/drive for the proposed Rocklin Commons shopping center Commons Drive.

The subject properties are generally located to the northwest and the southeast of the Sierra College Boulevard and Interstate 80 interchange. AP #'s: Crossings—045-053-045, -046, -049, -055, -056, -057 and 045-043-065; Loop Road—045-053-050; Commons—045-051-003, -004, and 045-041-012, -013, -024.

The properties are zoned Retail Business (C-2). The General Plan designations are Retail Commercial (RC).

Notice is hereby given that the City of Rocklin intends to file a Notice of Exemption pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15061(b)(3) Exemptions as it has been determined that there is no possibility that this project will have a significant effect on the environment, and thus is not subject to CEQA.

The applicant is RSC Engineering, Inc. The property owners are Rocklin Crossings, LLC and Rocklin Holdings, LLC; Rocklin Pavilions, LLC, and Rocklin Pavilions Sales, LLC (all c/o Donahue Schriber).

Staff report was waived.

The Commission had no questions for staff.

Applicant's representative, Mark Pearlberger addressed the Commission.

The Commission had no questions for the Applicant.

The hearing was opened to the public for their comments.  
There being none the hearing was closed.

The Planning Commission had no comments.

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner Coleman, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION FOR A STREET NAME CHANGE (Rocklin Crossings and Rocklin Commons Street Name Change / SNC-2009-01) was approved by the following vote:

Roll Call Vote:

AYES:	Commissioners Sully, Coleman, McKenzie, and Shirhall
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	Commissioner Menth
ABSTAIN:	None

Motion carried: 4/0

On a motion by Commissioner Sully and seconded by Commissioner Coleman, RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ROCKLIN RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A STREET NAME CHANGE (Rocklin Crossings and Rocklin Commons Street Name Change / SNC-2009-01) was approved by the following vote :

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Commissioners Sully, Coleman, McKenzie, and Shirhall  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Commissioner Menth  
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried: 4/0

**9. Reports and Discussion Items from Planning Commissioners – None**

**10. Reports from City Staff – None**

**11. Adjournment**

There being no further business brought before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Candace Johnson  
Planning Commission Secretary